

August 15, 2012

Atul C. Shah, MD
2884 Manorwood Drive
Troy, Michigan 48085
Telephone (248) 879-0795 Home
Telephone (248) 835-5025 Cell Phone

Representing Himself (Atul Shah) for
MLC GUC Claim No. 28820 filed by Atul Shah

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

*Seeming this to be a motion for
reargument under LBR 9023-1 or for
amendment of judgment under FRBP 9023 or
9024 (or FRCP 59 or 60, to which those
Bankruptcy Rules refer), motion denied. Claimant
Shah has failed to identify any matter that
might affect the outcome that the
court overlooked. See, e.g., In re
Delphia Business Solutions,
2002 WL 31557665 (Bankr.
SDNY 2002) and cases cited
therein.*

In re

Chapter 11 Case No.

MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, et al.,
F/k/a General Motors Corp., et al.

09-50026 (REG)

Debtor

(Jointly Administered)

*S/REG,
USBJ
9/27/2012*

**OBJECTIONS FILED BY ATUL C. SHAH, MD., CREDITOR,
TO THE "PROPOSED ORDER" DISALLOWING AND
EXPUNGING PROOF OF CLAIM NUMBER 28820**

NOW COMES Atul C. Shah, M.D., *In Pro Se*, and hereby files his Objections to the
Proposed Order Granting Debtor's Objections to Proof of Claim Number 28820
filed by Atul Shah. In support of his Objections, Atul Shah states as follows.

INTRODUCTION

Honorable Robert E. Gerber gave his judgment or conclusion on May 15th, 2012 at the
United States Bankruptcy Court, New York, New York in the presence of Plaintiff Atul
C. Shah, MD and in the presence of Defendant attorneys from Dickstein Shapiro LLP
representing Motors Liquidation Company GUC Trust.

Atul C. Shah, MD presents **four objections** to the Proposed Order [**Exhibit A**] as follow:

1. Atul C. Shah believes that the court had no authority to make its "**Decision on Objection**" which was contingent upon whether Atul C. Shah would appeal the judgment or not.

2. Deborah Kelly was granted permission to practice *Pro Hoc Vice* even though her apparent sponsor Stephanie Greer did not know whether the application had been granted or not. Also, the court did not know if the proper procedures had been followed for Ms Kelly's application.

3. The Proposed Order does not dispose of all the issues in the case. Specifically, the Honorable Court did not make any decision on Atul C. Shah's "**Motion to Vacate the Judgment**" forwarded on July 4, 2012 (ECF Doc 12002).

4. Description of Perceptions, Lack of Perceptions and Misperceptions in the court system.

Objection Number 1: Decision on Objection

Honorable Judge Robert E. Gerber rendered his judgment or Conclusion on May 15, 2012 at Bankruptcy court stating that Honorable Judge will provide lengthy dictated decision or putting in writing if Atul C. Shah, MD prefers to appeal the court ruling [**Exhibit B** from transcript page 80 lines 22 to 23].